



Atty. Docket No.: PC-1397

IFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT
AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Kirschner et.al
Serial No.: 10/608974
Filed: 06/27/2003
For: REPLACEABLE BLANK FIRING BARREL
Examiner: Michelle R. Thomson Group: 3641 Paper No.:

ELECTION

Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Honorable Commissioner:

I enclose the following papers:

1. ELECTION

Please enter the above correspondence.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian S. Steinberger
PTO Registration No. 36,423
Client No.: 23717
101 Brevard Avenue
Cocoa, Florida 32922
(321) 633-5080
Facsimile (321) 633-9322

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being sent by mail to the: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Patent and Trademark Office, P O Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

7/20/04
Date

Brian S. Steinberger
(Name of Person Mailing Papers)

(Signature of Person Mailing Papers)
Customer no.: 23717



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT
AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Kirschner et. al
Serial No.: 10/608,974
Filed: 06/27/2003
For: REPLACEABLE BLANK FIRING BARREL
Examiner: Michelle R. Thomson Group: 3641 Paper No.:

ELECTION

Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Action mailed June 23, 2004, Applicant elects to prosecute with traverse
Invention I, Claims 1 - 17.

Based on the restriction requirement Applicant lists claims identified by the methods readable thereon as
follows:

Invention number (I) Claims 1-17 are drawn to a barrel, classified in class 42, subclass 77.

Invention number (II) Claim 18 is drawn to a method of using a barrel, classified in class 89, subclass 29.

Invention number (III) Claims 19-25 are drawn to a method of forming a barrel, classified in class 89,
subclass 14.7.

In reference to the Restriction requirement, Applicants again wish to make their election to prosecute the
invention of Invention 1, Claims 1 -17. If further restrictions are merited, please let us know. Applicants disagree
with the restriction requirement for several reasons.

A policy consideration behind a restriction requirement would suggest that separate inventions exist that
inherently would include separate prior art searches, examinations, examiners, etc. The Primary Examiner does not
state that different art units and/or different examiners would need to search and examine the inventions of Invention
I through III. If Inventions I through III can be searched by the same art unit and further by the same examiner, then
having different examiners conduct separate searches and examinations would create an undue time and financial
burden on both the patent office and on the applicants.

Thus, any restriction requirement could have the effect of having different examiners working on the other inventions. Further, multiple examinations on these inventions would be repetitive and excessive. For these reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement.

Respectfully Submitted:



Brian S. Steinberger, Esq.
Registration No. 36,423
Law Offices of Brian S. Steinberger, P. A.
101 Brevard Avenue
Cocoa, Florida 32931
Telephone: (321) 633-5080 Fax: (321) 633-9322

Date 7/20/07